

**REMARKS**

Claims 27 to 33 are added, and therefore claims 12 to 33 are now pending.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the following.

Claims 13-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,987,534 (“Seta”).

As regards the anticipation rejections of the claims, to reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Office must demonstrate that each and every claim feature is identically described or contained in a single prior art reference. (*See Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). As explained herein, it is respectfully submitted that the prior Office Action does not meet this standard, for example, as to all of the features of the claims. Still further, not only must each of the claim features be identically described, an anticipatory reference must also enable a person having ordinary skill in the art to practice the claimed subject matter. (*See Akzo, N.V. v. U.S.I.T.C.*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1241, 1245 (Fed. Cir. 1986)).

As further regards the anticipation rejections, to the extent that the Office Action may be relying on the inherency doctrine, it is respectfully submitted that to rely on inherency, the Office must provide a “basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristics *necessarily* flows from the teachings of the applied art.” (*See* M.P.E.P. § 2112; emphasis in original; and *see Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int’f. 1990)). Thus, the M.P.E.P. and the case law make clear that simply because a certain result or characteristic may occur in the prior art does not establish the inherency of that result or characteristic.

While the rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, claim 12, as presented, provides that “when at least one error of at least one error type occurs in at least one of the image sensors, *replacing* the value of at least one parameter of the at least one image sensor *with a measured value of at least one other of the image sensors* of the image sensor system, wherein the measured value is associated with a parameter of the at least one other image sensor that corresponds to the at least one parameter of the at least one image sensor.” It is respectfully submitted that the Seta reference does not identically disclose (nor even suggest) these features, as provided for in the context of the claimed subject matter.

The Seta reference merely states that “where the SUM is smaller than a negative threshold value (-3500), . . . the program goes to step 11 where 1 is added to the current sub

gain indicating value GSUB", and it also refers to the reverse operation, i.e., a threshold value over (+3500) and subtracting 1 from GSUB. This, however, does not identically disclose (nor even suggest) "*replacing* the value of at least one parameter of the at least one image sensor *with a measured value of at least one other of the image sensors* of the image sensor system, wherein the measured value is associated with a parameter of the at least one other image sensor that corresponds to the at least one parameter of the at least one image sensor." Accordingly, claim 12, as presented, is allowable for these reasons.

Claims 13 to 16, and 27 depend from claim 12 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 17, 20, and 25, as presented, include features like those of the claim 12, as presented, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons, as are their respective dependent claims 18, 19, 21 to 24, and 26.

New claims 27 to 33 do not add any new matter and are supported by the present application, including the specification. New claims 27 to 33 depend from one of claims 12, 17, 20 and 25 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims.

In summary, all of claims 12 to 33 are allowable.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, ~~all of claims 12 to 33 are allowable.~~ It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections (and any objections) be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 5/30/2008

By: Gerard A. Messina

Gerard A. Messina  
(Reg. No. 35,952)  
One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
CUSTOMER NO. 26646

1525789